



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,822	10/24/2005	Mark Brister	PA1187	3938
28390	7590	10/22/2008	EXAMINER	
MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.			HOUSTON, ELIZABETH	
IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3576 UNOCAL PLACE				3731
SANTA ROSA, CA 95403				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/22/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rs.vascilegal@medtronic.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/531,822

Examiner

ELIZABETH HOUSTON

Applicant(s)

BRISTER, MARK

Art Unit

3731

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires ____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-6 and 8-25

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

/Todd E Manahan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to the limitation "cylindrical stent segments" applicant argues that the claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification and must be considered to possess their ordinary usage as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. While this is true, it is important to point out that the MPEP also states that while "understanding the claim language may be aided by explanations contained in the written description, it is important not to import into a claim, limitations that are not part of the claim." "Broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than justified." "The words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification. In this case the limitation "cylindrical stent segments" was afforded the broadest most reasonable interpretation by the examiner in order consider all possible scenarios and reduce the possibility of issuing a broad claim. The language was interpreted consistent with the specification, which did not recite a special definition for the terminology, without reading the specification into the claim. Applicant's arguments with respect to the cross section of the stent are moot as the argument of "cylindrical cross section" was not asserted by the examiner. However, examiner would like to point out that this interpretation by the applicant provides additional evidence that the language "cylindrical stent segments" has further interpretations not considered by the examiner. With respect to the limitation that the coating sections completely cover the outer surface of the stent segments, examiner again points out that claim recites "coating sections" completely cover and not that the coating completely covers. At this point that argument is irrelevant since the interpretation of the prior art is that the cavities are the stent segments and the coating section is the coating that completely covers the cavity.